

**REMARKS**

Entry of the foregoing, re-examination and reconsideration of the subject matter identified in caption, as amended, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, and in light of the remarks which follow, are respectfully requested.

Claim 24 has been amended to replace "©" with "(C)". In addition, claims 24 and 28 have been amended to further define the compound (C). These amendments are supported by the specification, for example, page 14, lines 6-12. Further, claim 28 has been amended to recite that the amount of the component (B) is 1 to 94% by mass. This amendment is supported by the specification, for example, Examples 7-9. Furthermore, claim 29 has been amended to recite an inorganic filler in an amount of 0 to 250 parts by mass. This amendment is supported by the specification, for example, page 20, lines 13-16. Moreover, claims 30-32 have been amended to change their dependency. Additionally, claims 24, 25, 28, 29, 31, and 33 have been amended to further improve their form and/or clarity. Claims 22, 23, 26 and 27 have been canceled without prejudice and disclaimer. Claims 1-21 were previously canceled.

No new matter has been added. Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 24, 25 and 28-34 will be all the claims pending in the application.

**I. Response to Claim Objection**

Claim 24 was objected to for alleged informalities.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 24 as amended does not contain informalities. Specifically, as noted above, claim 24 has been amended to correct the typographical error by replacing "©" with "(C)". Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection.

**II. Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claim 22.

**III. Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,586,496 or JP 2001-089743 ("Takamatsu"). Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are novel and patentable over Takamatsu for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 24 recites, *inter alia*, a cyclic polyether compound (C) represented by formula (6) and that the amount of the compound (C) is 0.3 to 10% by mass, based on the sum of the component (B) and the compound (C). Independent claim 28 recites, *inter alia*, a cyclic polyether compound (C) represented by formula (6) and that the amount of the compound (C) is 0.3 to 10% by mass, based on the sum of the component (B) and the compounds (C) and (D). The cyclic polyether compound (C) represented by formula (6) is not an epoxy compound.

The presently claimed invention can provide unexpected results by using the compound (C) in the specified amount. Specifically, as described at page 15, lines 11-16, of the present specification, the claimed composition can lead to stress-strain relaxation during curing by control of the curability of the photo-curable resin composition, thereby improving adhesive strength. These effects are further demonstrated by the examples in the present specification. In particular, the results in Table 1 show that Examples 4-9, which contained the compound (C) in an amount ranging from 1 to 8 mass%, were superior to Examples 1-3, which did not contain a compound (C), in terms of adhesive strength.

Takamatsu is relied upon as disclosing a composition containing a compound having an epoxy group, such as bisphenol F diglycidyl ether, as the compound (C) recited in the present claims (page 4, lines 1-4 of the Office Action). This compound is different from the compound (C) recited in present claims 24 and 28 as amended. Further, Takamatsu does not disclose or suggest the above-mentioned effects obtainable in the presently claimed composition.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 24 and 28 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Takamatsu and thus the rejection should be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 25 and 29-34 depend from claim 24 or 28, directly or indirectly, and thus are patentable over Takamatsu at least by virtue of their dependency.

#### IV. Conclusion

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order and such action is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions concerning this paper or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (202) 452-7932 at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: August 6, 2008

By: 

Fang Liu, Ph.D.

Registration No. 51283